

Appl. No. 10/775,234
Amendment dated December 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 10, 2007

REMARKS

In the September 10, 2007 Office Action, claims 6-9, 14-17, and 19 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 18 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 18 and 19 were objected to because they contained informalities. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the September 10, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 19, and canceled claim 18, as indicated above. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 6-9, 14-17, and 19 are pending, with claim 6 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Entry of August 1, 2007 Amendment

On page 1 of the Office Action, the Office Action indicates that Applicants' August 1, 2007 Amendment has been entered.

Objections

Claims 18 and 19 were objected to because they depend from claim 1 that had been canceled. In response, Applicants have canceled claim 18 and amended claim 19 to depend from claim 6. The withdrawal of objections is requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In items 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 6, 7, 9, and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,325 (Groe). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 6.

Appl. No. 10/775,234
Amendment dated December 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 10, 2007

In particular, Applicants have amended independent claim 6 to recite that the current source being directly connected to the third input, which was recited in original claim 18, and which was indicated in the Office Action as containing allowable subject matter. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by Groe or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 7, 9, and 14-17 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 6, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 7, 9, and 14-17 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 6, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In items 4-6 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,325 (Groe) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,559 (Fong). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 6 as mentioned above to recite the limitations of claim 18, which was indicated in the Office Action as containing allowable subject matter.

Therefore, Applicants believe that dependent claims 8 and 19 are allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 6, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 8 and 19 are further allowable

Appl. No. 10/775,234
Amendment dated December 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 10, 2007

because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 6, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims

It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does **not** make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an **apparent reason** for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the mixer circuit

Allowable Subject Matter

In items 8 and 9 of the Office Action, claim 18 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicants have incorporated the limitations of claim 18 into claim 6. Thus, independent claim 6 is believed to be allowable.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 6-9, 14-17, and 19 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: 12/7/07
S:\07-JUL07-A0\GK-US045033 Amendment.doc